

# BACONIANA.

---

VOL. II. *Third Series.* JULY, 1904.

---

No. 7.

## THE NORTHUMBERLAND MANUSCRIPT.

THE Northumberland Manuscript is well known to most students of the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy. It was found with other papers in a box, for many years unopened, at Northumberland House, Charing Cross. It consists apparently of a quire of twenty-four sheets, including the cover, one sheet and half the cover being now missing, and now contains ninety pages, in which various documents have been copied, mostly speeches or other papers composed by Francis Bacon. The points of chief interest of the document are, that on the cover are written lists of papers, some of which are copied within, and some are not so copied, and that these lists include, besides writings of Francis Bacon, two of the Shakespeare plays (not copied), namely, *Richard II.* and *Richard III.*, and further that the cover is written all over with a "scribble" of words, names and phrases, amongst which appear the name of Francis Bacon nine or ten times, and the name of William Shakespeare in full or abbreviated, ten or fifteen times. There are also Shakespeare quotations from *Lucrece* and from *Love's Labour's Lost*.

This association of the names and works of Francis

Bacon and William Shakespeare is remarkable, and constitutes the great interest of the Manuscript. How should it be explained?

The Duke of Northumberland has recently allowed the whole of the Manuscript to be photographed, and it will be immediately published by Messrs. Longmans. It has been carefully edited by Mr. Frank J. Burgoyne, librarian of the Lambeth Public Libraries, and collocation facsimiles, with transcripts on an enlarged scale of the cover, will be given.

Mr. Douse has recently published an interesting monograph on the Manuscript, with a facsimile of the cover.\*

Mr. Douse's careful research has identified, with high probability, the name of the scribe who wrote the whole or great part of the "scribble," a success on which he is to be congratulated. The document may be further studied in this fresh light, to endeavour to ascertain the circumstances under which it was written.

Mr. Douse identifies the writer of the "scribble" with John Davies, of Hereford, a professional scrivener, and the most skilful penman of his time, whose profession it was to copy documents for his various employers, and also to give instruction in the art of writing. Davies was employed for some time by the Earl of Northumberland (in the possession of whose descendants the Manuscript now is), and instructed the Earl's family in his art. He was also a scholar, educated at Oxford University, and a writer of numerous sonnets, among them several addressed to the Earl and Countess of Northumberland and other members of their family, and one addressed to Francis Bacon.

Mr. Douse supposes that the document was possibly presented by Bacon to the Earl of Northumberland, but

\* "The Northumberland Manuscript," by T. Le Marchant Douse, B.A. Taylor and Francis, 1904.

that it was more probably written by John Davies under the instructions, or for the use of the Earl. Neither of these hypotheses appears satisfactory.

John Davies certainly would not have so defaced with "scribble" one of his employer's books, nor would Bacon have presented a book so defaced to the Earl.

Mr. Douse agrees with Mr. Spedding that the "scribble," consisting of about 200 entries, was written by the penman "either for the trial of his pens or for experiments in handwriting." Why John Davies made use of this cover for the purpose, instead of taking a separate sheet, we know not; this it seems lay to his hand, and he so used it. Mr. Douse believes that the outer sheet was the outer page of the quire of paper which, when folded and stitched together, formed the manuscript book in which the contents were written. If this is so, the whole book must have belonged to John Davies himself, with the right to deal with it as he found convenient. This fact forms the basis of the history of the book. The book, as Mr. Douse points out, originally contained only the "Praises," of which a list is given in a handwriting different from the "scribble" at what Mr. Douse calls the N.E. quarter of the cover. These "Praises," called by Spedding "A Conference of Pleasure," were written by Francis Bacon in 1592, for a device to be presented by Essex before the Queen. Several copies of these speeches would doubtless be required for the performance, some of which would afterwards be superfluous, and this may be one.

Francis Bacon, as we know from his letters, employed scribes at Twickenham to write out or copy manuscripts for him, and would need such as were both skilful and scholarly. In 1592 John Davies was 27, and at the beginning of his career. It was fifteen years later, in 1607, that an entry appears in the Northumber-



land accounts of a payment showing his employment by the Earl. It seems highly probable, therefore, that in 1592 John Davies may have been in the employ of Francis Bacon, and this is confirmed by the following facts :—

(a) Seven of the documents in the book are Bacon's works, then unpublished, to which Davies could scarcely have access unless in Bacon's employ.

(b) Francis Bacon's name appears nine or ten times in the "scribble," showing some close connection.

(c) Eighteen or nineteen years afterwards, in 1610 or 1611, Davies published a sonnet to Francis Bacon, praising his bounty, from which, as Mr. Douse says, "it seems that Bacon had recently made him a present in money, or, more probably, had paid him lavishly for some assistance." Between 1603 and 1609 Bacon published a series of philosophical treatises, including the *Advancement of Learning*, and for these, or other work, would require the aid of a good penman and competent scholar, qualifications which Davies possessed, and which doubtless were liberally rewarded.

It may, therefore, be fairly inferred that John Davies was in Bacon's employ for some time, commencing about 1592, and again eighteen or nineteen years later.

The "Praises" are said to be written in the common engrossing hand, the uniform style of which precludes distinction of handwriting, but Spedding says that the use or misuse of points and capitals shows that the writer was probably "an ignorant lawyer's clerk." If so, these were not written by Davies in the course of his employment either for Bacon or the Earl, but may have been written by his clerk or by another scribe, and retained with Bacon's permission for Davies' own use.

Some years later the Manuscript seems to have come into the possession of the Earl of Northumberland, or

more likely, perhaps, of one of his sons when a pupil of Davies, and who might take interest in tilt-yard speeches. But during the period the "scribble" was being written, the book and its contents must have belonged to the writer, John Davies.

The "scribble" appears to relate to the first period of Davies' employment by Bacon, and must have been written when Davies was employed upon more important work, written out by himself, and for which he was trying his pen, or experimenting. On examination it will be found to extend over several years, and to give some clue to the nature of John Davies' employment, for a copyist trying his pen or experimenting in his handwriting would generally and naturally use some word or phrase from the document he was copying, and not let his imagination wander.

The ownership of the book by John Davies goes far to account for the desultory way in which the contents were selected, and for the irregular and imperfect lists indorsed on the cover, being in great part notes of documents not copied in that Manuscript, but upon which the writer was in some way engaged. These irregular lists are little consistent with the hypothesis of a formal Manuscript prepared by order of the Earl, or presented to him by Bacon.

The "Praises" constitute the first list written on the cover, and may be assigned to 1592, in which year the "Praises" were written.

The four documents copied in the book immediately following the "Praises" are all Bacon's works, probably of early date; one is said to have been written in 1589. None of these are mentioned on the cover. We are told nothing of the handwriting, and must assume that they were written by John Davies, the then owner of the Manuscript, or by his clerk, soon after the date of the "Praises."



Next follow four documents, also copied into the book, three of which are enumerated on the cover, and of these two are speeches composed by Bacon for the Earls of Essex and Sussex, "at the tilt," in 1595 and 1596.

Next follow on the cover "Orations at Graies Inne Revels," "Letter to the Queen's Maty by Mr. Francis Bacon," and "Essaies by the same author." None of these are copied.

The seven last-mentioned documents form the second list on the cover and must be assigned to 1595 to 1597. Bacon's Essays, first published, appeared in 1597.

Then follows the third and last list. There is written on the cover "By Mr. Francis Bacon"—"William Shakespeare," these nearly side by side, and a little below are written, "Rychard the second," "Rychard the third," "Asmund and Cornelia," "Ile of Dogs, fragment by Thomas Nashe, inferior plaier." None of these are copied in this book; they would be too long to be contained in it, but these entries seem to show that John Davies was employed on or intended to copy them.

*Richard II.* and *Richard III.*, though written about 1592 or 1593, were first printed anonymously in 1597. Nash's play of the *Ile of Dogs* was produced in 1597.

These lists and the documents copied show that the connection between the writer and Francis Bacon continued up to 1597, and perhaps for some years later.

Let us now consider the contents, and search in the "scribble" to find any further clue to the work on which this skilful penman was engaged during this period.

That he had been working for Francis Bacon, and upon his writings, is indicated by the nine or ten repetitions of his name in the "scribble," and is confirmed by the contents of the Manuscript.

It also appears that the writer was engaged in some way on works of William Shakespeare, whose name in full appears in the "scribble" five times, and the surname in full three times, besides seven incomplete beginnings of the name. Moreover, the two plays, *Richard II.* and *Richard III.*, are named, and two scraps quoted from *Lucrece* and *Love's Labour's Lost* are also found in the "scribble." What, then, was John Davies' employment in connection with these works?

Observe first that the name is always, eight times over, spelt "Shakespeare," a new form invented in 1593 and never known to be used before, first appearing in print at the foot of the dedication to Lord Southampton of *Venus and Adonis* in 1593, and reappearing in 1594 in the dedication of *Lucrece*, and after 1598 printed on the title-page of many of the plays.

Who invented this new form of the name? The common theory seems to be that William Shakspeare, when first about to appear in print in 1593, determined to adopt this form in lieu of the "Shakspeare" of his baptismal register, or the "Shagspere" of his marriage bond, or any of the numerous variants used by his family; but if so, why did he never so sign his name in any of his five known signatures?

John Davies, who had probably entered Bacon's employment in the previous year, 1592, the year of the "Praises," seems to have been amazingly struck with this new or transformed name, writing it out so many times, and always in the new form. Where did he find the name until it appeared in print? and, if it had already so appeared, what could be the use of writing it out repeatedly?

Why did John Davies so diligently practice his pen in this new name? Must not his purpose have been, that he was intending to write this signature to some document, and this by Bacon's instructions?



Now the only documents to which the signature "William Shakespeare" is known to have been ever placed are the two dedications to Lord Southampton of *Venus and Adonis*, and *Lucrece*. And someone at or about this period did write this signature at the foot of each of these dedications, and John Davies was at or about this same period practising the signature with intent to write it somewhere, but where if not to these dedications?

The "scribble" itself contains a curious piece of evidence confirmatory of John Davies being the writer of the signatures to the dedications. For it contains a line from *Lucrece*, "Revealing day through every crany pepes, and"—this seems to indicate that the writer was then engaged in copying that poem; and this must have been before the poem was printed and published. The broken sentence betokens a scrap copied, rather than a quotation from memory. If John Davies was employed to write out *Lucrece*, he may well have also written out *Venus and Adonis*.

Some further points must be noted.

All the repetitions of the name "William Shakespeare" whether inchoate or complete, are found in a group at the foot of the cover. The uppermost of the group, a well-written signature, follows on just below the quotation from *Lucrece*, and seems to be in the same handwriting, and to be connected with it. The rest of the group are more irregular. It is possible these were experiments of the previous year, when *Venus and Adonis* was being copied. This, however, is conjecture, based only on the likelihood of these experiments having been made when the name was first used, and before it had appeared in print, and on the bolder character of the upper signature.

It seems likely that a penman trying his pen upon the outer cover of a partly filled manuscript book would



begin his scribble at the bottom of the cover, leaving the upper space free for additional lists. This seems to have been the course in the present case. This group of names, if written when the poems came out, was so written when only the first list appeared on the upper part of the cover. The group, except the upper name, may have been written in 1593, when *Venus and Adonis* and its dedication were copied. Then the quotation from *Lucrece*, and its accompanying signature, may have been written in 1594.

After this the second list of documents of 1595 to 1597 would be written, and then the third list containing the titles of *Richard II.* and *Richard III.*, which may be assigned to 1597.

If Francis Bacon was the real author of these poems, whose polished and classic verse could scarcely emerge from Stratford, he would require a skilful penman to copy them for Southampton, and afterwards for the printer; and the scribbled quotation from *Lucrece* is some evidence that John Davies, then in his employ, did copy that poem, and he may also have copied *Venus and Adonis*. But the penman would also have to copy the dedications and the new signature, *and it would be necessary that the form of signature to be adopted, with its lines and flourishes, should be studied and its execution practised.*

We may thus in this manuscript be witnessing the birth of the name "William Shakespeare."

This would completely explain John Davies' action, otherwise seeming inexplicable.

If Francis Bacon devised and adopted the name "William Shakespeare," he must be the author not only of the poems, but also of the plays published under that name.

If the author of the plays was desirous of concealment, he would need to discover or invent some poet,

to whom the authorship of the plays, then appearing anonymously, might be plausibly assigned. And in or about 1595, the year following the publication of *Lucrece*, the plays, though still anonymous, were already attributed to the author of the poems, for Weever in one of his epigrams (which he says were mostly written four years before their publication in 1599), addressed to "honietong'd Shakespeare," praises the poems, and refers to the same author "Romeo and Richard, more whose names I know not."

The mention in this manuscript of the two Shakespeare plays, *Richard II.* and *Richard III.*, and the quotations from *Lucrece* and *Love's Labour's Lost* are, therefore, consistent with, and tend to confirm the suggested origin of the name "William Shakespeare;" shewing a common origin of plays and poems, issuing apparently from the same scriptorium, under the direction of Francis Bacon.

No certain reliance can perhaps be placed on the proximity of the two names Francis Bacon and William Shakespeare, but it deserves note.

The more important points are that these plays, which are believed to have been produced in the years 1592 and 1593, were printed anonymously in 1597, but not until 1598 with the name of William Shakespeare.

In 1597 copies of these plays would be required for the printer, and in that year John Davies seems to have been engaged on them, and apparently while in Bacon's employ.

How should Francis Bacon, if he was not the author, obtain copies from the theatre? and why, if not the author, should he wish to have them copied?

If Francis Bacon was the author he would require also copies for the theatre, "unblotted copies" such as Heming and Condell admired.

Another of the Shakespeare plays, *Love's Labour's*



*Lost*, first printed in 1598, appears to have come under Davies' hands for copying. The long word "honorificabilitudine" appears in the "scribble," nor is it surprising that Davies should experiment upon it, before committing it to writing in his fair copy.

Why should Bacon desire a copy of this play? and where should he obtain it, unless he was the author? in which case the facts are remarkably consistent. The coincident dates connect Davies' employment with the poems and plays then being produced.

A discrepancy has been noticed between the quotations from *Lucrece* and from *Love's Labour's Lost* and the received text, but the quotations may have agreed with the early editions.

If, however, Francis Bacon was the real author of these poems and plays his authorship was carefully concealed. John Davies, like others, was allowed to suppose that William Shakspeare wrote them, and in 1610 he addressed one of his numerous epigrams in the "Scourge of Folly" to "Our English Terence, Mr. Will Shakespeare" in which, and in another poem in his "Microcosmus," his praise of Shakespeare's wit is qualified by pity for his profession.

In the light of present knowledge and criticism the close connection of Francis Bacon with the poems and these early plays is curiously significant.

Mr. Douse notices that after the words on the cover "Essaies by the same Author" appears a word which he reads "printing," and he suggests that the intended printing of the Essays accounts for their not being copied. Perhaps a simpler explanation would be that the Essays are noted to be copied for printing. The like explanation might extend to the notice of the plays mentioned just below.

Of the other entries in the "scribble" one was doubtless written while Davies was employed by Bacon,

namely, "Anthony comfort and consorter," which was perhaps part of a draft dedication of the "Essaies" mentioned among the list of documents to be copied, which, when published in 1597 were dedicated to his "loving and beloved brother." Other entries appear, as Mr. Douse says, to be part of the subscription to letters. Of others the connection cannot now be traced.

*Asmund and Cornelia* is an unknown play.

"The *Ile of Dogs* by Thos. Nash, a fragment," appears in the list and brings down the date of the entries to 1597, in which year it was produced. The author was sent to prison on account of its scandalous character, notwithstanding his excuse that he only wrote the first part, probably the "fragment" referred to.

On careful examination this document appears to be one of the many facts, which while not amounting separately to demonstration of Francis Bacon's authorship of the Shakespeare plays, yet curiously and exactly fit into that theory, and are indeed difficult otherwise to explain.

Mr. Douse has imbibed, and expresses in no measured terms, a strong prejudice against Francis Bacon, ignoring Spedding's vindication of his character from Macaulay's unfair and inaccurate estimate. The judgment of Bacon's friends who most intimately knew him, should outweigh the accusations of his enemies; and Aubrey testifies that "all who were good and great loved and honoured him." Mr. Douse's prejudice even leads him to imagine, that the scrivener's quotation of Francis Bacon's touching apostrophe to his brother "Anthony comfort and consorter," "suggests a rebuke of the toadyism of Francis in selecting and *more suo* grossly flattering the terrible old termagant on the throne in preference to such a brother!" With equal logic Mr. Douse supposes, that "it is upon Shake-



speare that the scribbler most fondly expatiates, besides quoting twice from him, *for he loved him!* ”

This prejudice detracts from the value of Mr. Douse's investigation and limits its scope.

The Northumberland Manuscript, fully and fairly considered, appears to point to the following conclusions. That the writer of the “scribble” whom we may accept as identified with John Davies, of Hereford, was in the employment of Francis Bacon during several years from about 1592 to 1597, and again some eighteen or nineteen years later. That the greater part of the “scribble” was written during the earlier period of his employment by Francis Bacon. That the writer was during this period engaged on works written by Bacon, and also on the Shakespeare poems, then produced under the new or transformed name of “William Shakespeare,” and also upon some of the plays produced at the same time, and attributed to the same author. That the writer diligently practised this new name presumably for the purpose of writing it in some document. That as the only documents to which that signature is known to have been subscribed are the dedications to Lord Southampton of *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece*, and these were so subscribed at that period, the fair inference is, that it was John Davies, acting under Bacon's instructions, who subscribed this name to those dedications. That the quotation from *Lucrece* is some evidence that he was employed to copy that poem, and therefore the dedication, and he may not improbably have also copied *Venus and Adonis*, and this he must probably have done before the poems were printed and published. That this conclusion is strengthened by the polish of the verse, and by Bacon's intimacy with Southampton. That the inclusion in the lists of two, and the quotation from a third of the plays published at this period, and attributed to the author

of the poems, indicates that John Davies was employed by Francis Bacon to copy these plays before their publication, and points to Francis Bacon as the author of the poems and plays published under the name of "William Shakespeare."

G. C. BOMPAS.

---

## MACAULAY AND BACON.

IT is beyond doubt that the present-day estimate of Bacon's character is mainly founded on the opinions of Macaulay formulated in his notorious *Essay*. Indeed, only the other day in an edition of Bacon's Essays, prescribed for the King's Scholarship Examination, 1904, an Editor had the courage to write, "Bacon did not feel much interest in the English language," and "Bacon was not a great original thinker like Berkeley, nor an imaginative genius like Shakespeare," and follows this *dictum* up with the bold assertion :—"No attempt has been made in this edition to treat of Bacon's life; an *unbiassed* account of it is within the reach of most students in Macaulay's Essays." Fancy going to Macaulay for an "unbiassed" account of Bacon's life!

The fact is, Macaulay is at last being found out, and his true value appraised. Lord Acton, in his letters to Mary Gladstone, wrote :—

"When you sit down to Macaulay, remember that the Essays are really flashy and superficial. He was not above par in literary criticism; his Indian articles will not hold water; and his two most famous reviews, on Bacon and Ranke, show his incompetence. The Essays are only pleasant reading, and a key to half the prejudices of our age. It is the history (with one or two speeches) that is wonderful. He knew nothing respectably before the seventeenth century; he knew nothing of foreign history,



of religion, philosophy, science, or art. His account of debates has been thrown into the shade by Ranke, his account of diplomatic affairs by Klopp. He is, I am persuaded, grossly, basely unfair. Read him, therefore, to find out how it comes that the most unsympathetic of critics can think him very nearly the greatest of English writers."

Later on, Lord Acton describes Macaulay as "utterly base, contemptible, and odious." As a corrective of Macaulay's criticism of Bacon, I would recommend every Baconian to purchase a copy, price half-a-crown, of the latest volume of Longmans' British Classics — "Macaulay's Essay on Bacon," edited by David Salmon, Principal of Swansea Training College. This is a scholarly little work, full of information.

In his Introduction Mr. Salmon says:—

"Macaulay was always profoundly convinced of the correctness of his own view, and deeply anxious, even to the extent of becoming strident and over-emphatic, that everyone else should agree with him. So he readily wins over the uncritical, while in the more censorious he rouses opposition. He may be said truly to write 'at the top of his voice.'"

Then Mr. Salmon launches out with the conviction that the Essay on Bacon is:—

"The least successful partly because it is the longest. It is weakened by what Falstaff would call 'damnable iteration,' by digression after digression, by digression within digression, by elaborate demonstrations of propositions which no man with sense would deny, and more elaborate demonstrations of propositions which no man with knowledge would admit. It is not surprising, therefore, that Macaulay should be so late in reaching the end when he succumbs so often to temptations to leave the direct road."

According to Mr. Salmon,

"The Essay is divided into two sections, the first half the life, and the second the writings, as chief subject, and if anything could exceed the exaggeration of the faults of Bacon's life in the

first, it is the misrepresentation of the aims and results of his writings in the second. Macaulay had undertaken a task for which his mental constitution unfitted him. . . . Macaulay's method did very well for one whose business is epigram—like Pope. . . . But the business of the historian is truth, not epigram."

No less severe is Mr. Salmon on Macaulay's "impartiality." This is what he says:—

"Macaulay, besides lacking the insight necessary to the understanding of a complex character, lacked impartiality. He was bound to take a side, and that side was always dazzling white, while the other was always unrelieved black. His mind was an advocate's, not a judge's. Instead of examining all the facts and weighing all the arguments, and then arriving at a conclusion, weak in proportion as the facts and arguments were mutually destructive, he began with a strong conclusion and proceeded to state the reasons for it, ignoring or flouting the rest. If he had chosen the wrong conclusion to start with, the greater the dialectic skill with which he arrayed the resources placed at his disposal by his vast reading and marvellous memory, the farther did he go astray from truth.

"A kindred defect to partiality was dogmatism. It was natural that a man who honestly thought his side entirely right and the other side entirely wrong should express himself strongly. Sydney Smith wished that he wished he could be as sure of one thing as Macaulay was of everything."

Mr. Salmon continues the onslaught on Macaulay in the following vigorous fashion:—

"Macaulay denies to Bacon the benefit of excuses which he himself tenders for others. When speaking of the statesmen who, during the reign of Mary, 'had contrived to have business on the continent, or if they stayed in England' had 'heard mass and kept Lent with great decorum,' and who intrigued with James while professing undivided loyalty to Elizabeth, he says, 'It is impossible to deny that they committed many acts which would justly bring on a statesman of our day censures of the most serious kind, but,' he adds with perfect equity, 'when we consider the state of morality in their age and the unscrupulous character of the adversaries against whom they had to contend,



we are forced to admit that it is not without reason that their names are still held in veneration by their countrymen.' Still, when he comes to deal with the faults of Bacon (many of them, in Bacon's own words, *vitia temporis* and not *vitia hominis*) he will make no allowance ; the offences of the sixteenth century must be measured by the standard of the nineteenth. Hence, when as prosecuting counsel he should have been content with the French finding of ' guilty, with extenuating circumstances,' he presses for an unqualified verdict and a rigorous sentence.

"This is strikingly illustrated in the case of Peacham. That unfortunate ecclesiastic appears to have been a bit of a fool and a good deal of a liar, and his innocence of the charges brought against him is doubtful ; but he did not necessarily deserve the rack because he did not deserve admiration. Macaulay, therefore, did well to be angry, but the vials of even righteous wrath should not be poured on the wrong head. He speaks of Bacon's being employed to torture the prisoner (p. 49, l. 9) and going to the Tower to listen to his yells (p. 52, l. 24). This is a gross injustice, and it is hard to understand how so honourable a man as Macaulay could have perpetrated it knowing all the facts, while it is equally hard to understand how so omniscient a man as Macaulay could have perpetrated it without knowing them.

"Bacon had no more to do with the arrest of Peacham, with the formulation of the charges, with his preliminary examination, with his committal to the Tower, or with the order for his torture, than with the casting of the prophet Daniel into the lions' den. Macaulay has not a word of indignation for the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Treasurer, and the other high and mighty persons who signed the warrant for the torture ; he reserves his reproaches for a subordinate law-officer who was bound to be present at it in the discharge of his official duties, and speaks of him in terms which could hardly have been stronger if Bacon had worked the rack with his own hands to gratify his lust of cruelty.

" . . . I have thought it sufficient to give the student this general warning, that in the elaborate contrast which Macaulay institutes between modern science and ancient philosophy he misrepresents both. He asserts that the object of the one is, and assumes that the object of the other ought to have been, utility. The man of science is engaged, and the philosopher was engaged, in the pursuit of truth, not in the invention of

machines; and the fact that the results achieved by the one can often be applied to machines while the results achieved by the other could not, arises not from a difference in their aims, but from a difference in their materials.

"The philosopher was engaged in ethical and metaphysical speculations, and the result of his discoveries would be, not useful contrivances but rules of conduct or views of life and destiny. To blame him for failing to introduce new crafts is equivalent to blaming Moses for presenting the Commandments written on tables of stone instead of teaching the art of printing on paper."

Few scholars will disagree with this estimate of Macaulay's treatment of Bacon, and fewer still will be inclined to combat the statements made by Mr. Salmon in the valuable "Notes," appended to the work, where, in some instances, Macaulay is simply scalped and flayed alive.

Here are a few :—

"*The most abject apologies.*—Macaulay was incapable of making a statement which he knew to be false, but in the course of an argument he often, unconsciously, presented facts in such a way as to produce a false impression. The letter to the Lord Treasurer was not an abject apology (indeed for Bacon it was a bold justification), and the letter to the Lord Keeper, though not what we should consider manly, is not so unmanly as Macaulay represents it."

"*Let us be just to Bacon.*—Bacon appeared against Essex at both trials, the first before the Commission at York House, and the second after the failure of the rising in the City. In both Bacon had but one alternative to appearing for the Crown—resigning his position as Queen's Counsel—and thus not only aggravating his chronic money difficulties, but also destroying all hopes of success in his profession. There is abundant evidence that up to and after the first trial Bacon had done all he could to restore Essex to favour; indeed, he had been so zealous for his patron that he had roused Elizabeth's anger. He was commanded to draw up an account of what had been done, and he passed over the faults of Essex so lightly that the Queen said she 'perceived old love would not easily be forgotten.' With regard to

the treason case, Bacon's contemporaries do not blame him for the way in which he had acquitted himself so much as for not refusing to have anything to do with it. 'Mr. Francis Bacon's behaviour towards the Earl at his trial was perhaps less exceptionable than his submitting to any share in it.' (Birch)."

"*To murder the Earl's fame.*—If the 'Declaration' is a truthful statement, it was Essex himself who murdered the Earl's fame, and if it was not a truthful statement Bacon should not be singled out for special reprobation, as the Queen and the whole Council were equally guilty, his draft having been 'perused, weighed, censured, altered and made almost a new writing' by the Councillors, and afterwards 'exactly perused by the Queen herself and some alterations again made by her appointment.' And Bacon could not consistently have refused the use of the most skilful pen then in the service of the Government. The refusal to write an account of the treason would have been the severest condemnation of Bacon's own act in helping to bring the traitor to his doom."

"*Bacon's 'Mercenary Marriage.'*—That portion, a quarter of her father's fortune (which she shared with her three sisters) seems to have been £220 a year. As Bacon settled an additional £500 a year on her, the suggestion that he made a mercenary marriage is unfounded."

"*Oliver St. John.*—It is difficult to see much that is blameworthy in the conduct of Bacon in this business. As Attorney-General he was bound to prosecute for the Crown. When a barrister defends a person of whose innocence he is not convinced he is not held to approve the crime with which the person is charged; similarly, when Bacon prosecuted a person who had tried to stop the flow of contributions to the King, he could not be held to approve of the subscription. As a matter of fact, he did approve of it, and Coke himself had declared that it was not contrary to the laws of the realm. We may think it strange that Bacon did not consider the attempt to obtain benevolences wrong, but we can hardly reproach him for discharging his official duties when he considered it right."

"*Peacham.*—With regard to the second count, if Macaulay had not been more eager to prove a case than to ascertain the truth he would not have singled Bacon out for special condemnation. Bacon was not 'employed' to torture the prisoner; he did not instigate the torture, and he was present at it only in the discharge



of his duties, as were seven other officials, several more highly placed than he."

"The warrant for the torture was issued by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Treasurer, the Lord Steward, the Lord Privy Seal, the principal Secretary of State, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Master of the Rolls, and Lord Stanhope. Bacon was one of the persons to whom it was addressed, and up to this time there is no evidence that he had had anything to do with the case, directly or indirectly."

"There is no reason why Macaulay should exert all the resources of rhetoric to secure the condemnation of one who played only a subordinate part, and that only in the discharge of his official duties, in an act which he did not regard with the horror with which Macaulay rightly regarded it."

"*Examined by Bacon.*—Macaulay has no authority whatever for this. Bacon was, of course, present, but the report of the first examination is in the handwriting of Winwood, and the second examination is expressly stated to be made by the four law-officers. (Spedding, "Letters," V. 94, 127)."

"*The yells of Peacham.*—To represent Bacon as going to the Tower 'to listen to the yells of Peacham' passes the bounds of even unfair criticism."

"*He made the most of his short respite.*—In the following sentences Macaulay's paraphrase grossly misrepresents his authority, Thomas Bushell, one of Bacon's servants, and that authority is a bad one at best, as Bushell wrote only from memory, and long after the event, and we know that many of the statements which he makes respecting Bacon are wrong. In addition to which Mr. Spedding places at a period anterior to the bribery charges the interview at which the words are said to have been spoken. ("Letters," VII. 199)."

"*He assures us that Bacon was innocent.*—Of all the presents made to Bacon a very small number indeed came from the parties to pending suits—the rest were strictly in accordance with the established custom. The custom was bad, but if Bacon was black he was very little blacker than the men of his time—than many who are highly praised earlier in the Essay. If Macaulay had correctly represented Montagu he would have saved himself the trouble (or deprived himself of the pleasure?) of writing the next dozen pages of argument and declamation."

"*Solemnly declares himself guilty.*—I must repeat that Montagu does not impute such conduct to Bacon."

To those wiseacres, who have never read Bacon's works, but who declare that Bacon had only one style—a "dry-as-dust" style, they call it, and quite unlike that of Shakespeare, of course—and to Macaulay, who maintained that Bacon had only two styles, an earlier, and a later; Mr. Salmon provides an excellent reply in his quotation from Dr. Abbott:—

"Bacon's style varied almost as much as his handwriting; but it was influenced more by the subject-matter than by youth or old age. Few men have shown equal versatility in adapting their language to the slightest shade of circumstance and purpose. His style depended upon whether he was addressing a king, or a great nobleman, or a philosopher, or a friend; whether he was composing a State paper, pleading in a State trial, magnifying the Prerogative, extolling Truth, discussing studies, exhorting a judge, sending a New Year's present, or sounding a trumpet to prepare the way for the Kingdom of Man over Nature. It is a mistake to suppose that Bacon was never florid till he grew old. On the contrary, in the early Devices, written during his connection with Essex, he uses a rich exuberant style and poetic rhythm; but he prefers the rhetorical question of appeal to the complex period. On the other hand in all his formal philosophical works, even in the *Advancement of Learning*, published as early as 1605, he uses the graver periodic structure, though often illustrated with rich metaphor."

After these extracts from Mr. Salmon's admirable little work, readers of BACONIANA will be inclined to agree with Sidney Smith when he said he wished he could be "as sure of one thing as Macaulay was of everything."

GEORGE STRONACH.

## “STUDIES IN SHAKESPEARE.”

**M**R. CHURTON COLLINS, the author of these recently republished essays (Constable & Co.), is admittedly a learned and able man. Let him alone while he is holding the floor upon a subject of which he has mastery and all will be well. He illuminates and delights. But if some poor gentleman venture to cross his line of thought he turns and rends with the fervour and assumption of a Dr. Johnson. It is this boisterous dogmatism which pleases the journalists, whose comments in their turn increase Mr. Collins' sense of his own infallibility. In what he believes to be the service of truth, but what is more probably the defence of a prepossession burnt into his mind while editing Shakespeare for the use of schools, he cannot discriminate between the author of plays, who adopted, to use the words of Mr. George Moore, “the sweet illusive pen name of Shakespeare,” and the actor whose name was so skillfully utilised.

A sound classical education and good manners do not necessarily go together, and one at least of these studies conveys a strong indication of the unsuitability of an emotional temperament to the discussion of a question of circumstantial evidence. “Lawyers,” remarks Mr. Collins, “are constitutionally insensible of what relates to æsthetic.” This defect appears to be shared by purely literary men. How otherwise could Dr. Johnson, for instance, have missed perceiving the supreme quality of Shakespeare's prose?

Says Mr. Collins: “Yet Dr. Johnson, who edited Shakespeare, could say that Sir William Temple was the first writer who gave harmony to English prose!” Professor Dowden is also to be found unable to detect the Shakespearean flavour of *Titus Andronicus*. At page 125 of the “Studies” Mr. Collins sums up:



“Such is the case for *Titus Andronicus* which Professor Dowden coolly dismisses as the work of an anonymous writer.” Baconians agree with Professor Dowden, but they go further and assert that they have succeeded in discovering who the anonymous writer was. Perhaps the most interesting study in connection with Mr. Collins’ work is to note the continual conflict waged between his intellect and his prepossessions. He proves to demonstration the facile and complete classical knowledge shown in the plays, but satisfies himself with the pure speculation that an advanced *curriculum* projected by England’s magnificent Cardinal for a special school at his birthplace—which school by-the-bye was never built—was taught in a little school-room at Stratford-on-Avon, and this despite what is recorded as to the collapse of learning even at the Universities at this period (1570—1590).

Because the school was there, he assumes that the actor attended it. The available evidence points rather the other way. A scholar should be able to write. The school was in existence when the actor’s father was a boy, yet *he* could not sign his name. It existed when the actor’s daughter was growing up, nevertheless *she* used a mark. There is nothing in the five possible specimens of the actor’s signature to suggest facility with the pen, or even that he learned to write at Stratford. Mr. Collins surmises that he went to school at the age of seven, but the boy was far more likely to have been busily employed in helping to look after his younger brothers and sisters.

Upon this branch of enquiry I give an interesting sentence by Mr. Collins (page 14), who writes, “Sainte Beuve has finely said that the first aim of criticism should be the discovery of truth” :—

“The headmaster when Shakespeare entered the school was Walter Roche.”

It is true that a schoolmaster is recorded to have been at Stratford from 1570 onwards, drawing an annual stipend of £20. But why *headmaster*? What were the names of the junior masters, if any, and what was the date of Shakspeare's entry? Mrs. Stopes, writing upon this subject, confines her observations to this:—"Thomas Hunt was the schoolmaster in Shakspeare's time." I prefer her modesty of statement to Mr. Collins' gratuitous assumptions.

In another "Study" Mr. Collins illustrates the legal attainments of the author of the plays, and concludes: "Enough have been cited to prove not only that Shakespeare had a remarkably extensive and accurate acquaintance with the English law, but that his memory during his whole career was habitually reverting to it and to its associations." Why "*memory*," and why "*reverting*?" They must be accounted for by the prepossessions of Mr. Collins' mind. He is satisfied that Shakespeare was once a lawyer's clerk at Stratford, so that his "*memory*" of what was familiar to him when a clerk has to suit the hypothesis by "*reverting*."

In what way does Mr. Collins satisfy himself, how does he pursue his chief aim—the discovery of truth? This is how he proceeds:—"It is therefore quite possible that the conjecture of Chalmers corroborated by Malone, and supported by Payne Collier and Lord Campbell, namely, that Shakespeare was in early life employed as clerk in an attorney's office may be correct."

"What is truth?" said jesting Pilate. Mr. Collins would reply, Sufficient for me is a *corroborated conjecture* supported by Payne Collier. Mr. Payne Collier was a practical man. Finding Shakespearian evidence very deficient he supplemented it with fabrication. For a list of his fabrications reference may be made to Mr. Lee's "Life of Shakespeare." To such a solid

substratum why did Mr. Collins add Lord Campbell? His name might surely have been spared the association, particularly seeing that eighteen pages earlier Mr. Collins states: “Campbell, while acknowledging that there is not sufficient evidence to justify the conclusion that Shakespeare was actually a clerk in a lawyer’s office, expresses,” etc.

Lord Campbell noticed (though Mr. Collins fails to remind us) that the author of the plays “had a deep technical knowledge of the law” and “was very familiar with some of the most abstruse proceedings in English jurisprudence.” Let it first be discovered whether there existed any Stratford attorney during Shakspeare’s youth. We are told that a small debt court existed there, and presumably, but by no means surely, an attorney or two. We are next asked to assume that Shakspeare was clerk to such an attorney, and then left to guess how, without text books, which were not to be had except amongst the barristers of the Inns of Court, without access to the few Norman Latin reports then in existence, without Chancery practice, and probably without any conveyancing to speak of, this clerk acquired the extensive and accurate acquaintance with English law to which his “memory,” according to Mr. Collins, was habitually “reverting.” One thing an attorney’s clerk is free to do, likes to do, and generally does, is to make his own Will. Shakspeare employed a Warwick scrivener.

I find more satisfaction in Mr. Collins’ “Shakespeare and Sophocles,” in which he gives an exceedingly life-like character study of Francis Bacon, Baron Verulam Viscount St. Alban, although ostensibly describing the writer of the plays.

“He was essentially aristocratic in temper and sympathy.”

“He was profoundly interested in the public events of his time, employing the drama as a commentary on current State



affairs, and a direct means of political education as the ally of the Ministers of Elizabeth and James."

"In him coexisted the temperament and pursuits of the poet and of the philosopher, with the tastes and habits of a man of the world."

"He possessed easy temper, geniality, good nature, modesty, and pleasant wit."

"He possessed æsthetic sensibility and profound reflexion, inspired insight into spiritual truth, and sympathetic insight into dramatic truth."

"He had comprehensiveness in combination and minute and exact accuracy in observation."

"With as precise a hand as Bacon does he sunder the celestial from the terrestrial kingdom, the things of earth from the things of heaven."

Much to the same effect has been already said of Lord St. Alban. Mark many coincidences of expression:—

"The judgment of average men he despised as a thinker, a politician, and a courtier."—*Dean Church*.

"He took an active part in every Parliament; he was an adviser of the Crown."—*Macaulay*.

"A most indefatigable servant of the King and a most earnest lover of the public."—*Tobie Matthew*.

"Bacon was a poet. His language has a sweet and majestic rhythm which satisfies the sense no less than the almost super-human wisdom of his philosophy."—*P. B. Shelley*.

"Scarcely any man has been better entitled to be called a thorough man of the world."—*Macaulay*.

"A man most sweet in his conversation and ways."—*Tobie Matthew*.

"He was abundantly facetious, which took much with the Queen."—*Sir Robert Naunton*.

"His language when he could spare or pass by a jest was nobly censorious."—*Ben Jonson*.

"His powers were varied and in great perfection, his nerves exquisitely acute."—*Montagu*.

"This lord was religious."—*Rawley*.

"With great minuteness of observation he had an aptitude of comprehension such as has never yet been vouchsafed to any other human being."—*Macaulay*.

Ages ago was laid down the axiom that things which are equal to the same are equal to one another. Let X stand for the play writer and B for the person whose surname does not appeal to “æsthetic.” The comprehensiveness and minuteness of observation which Mr. Collins notices in X, Macaulay observes in B. Both state their subject to have been a thorough man of the world. The poetic and philosophic temperament Mr. Collins remarks in X, a great authority (Shelley) praises in B. The easy temper, geniality, and pleasant wit which Mr. Collins detects in X is severally testified concerning B by three witnesses who knew him personally and intimately, viz., Tobie Matthew, Ben Jonson, and Sir Robert Naunton. Finally, while X, according to Mr. Collins, used the drama as a means of political education and as the ally of the Government, B, from the age of 25 until his death, was engaged in politically educating his sovereign and superior ministers.

Mr. Collins tells us that the author of the plays loved and immortalized in description the place of his birth, but he fails to specify the “numberless passages in Shakespeare’s poems and plays recalling Stratford.” On the other hand, we do know that frequent references to London and St. Albans are to be found in the plays. May I add the affectionate references to the same cities: to London in the “Prothalamion,” and to old St. Albans ‘Verlame’ in the “Ruines of Time,” which, according to the cipher story, were written by Lord St. Alban under the name of Spenser.

With regard to the “Study,” entitled, “The Bacon-Shakespeare Mania,” which, following the example of Mr. Lee in the “Life of Shakespeare,” and of Mr. W. C. Hazlitt in “Shakespear,” Mr. Collins places at the end of his book, it may be said generally that the case for Baconian authorship is now so vast and extensive that there must necessarily be weak points for critics to

attack. The late Judge Webb may or may not have been correct in his surmise as to the meaning of the sonnet referring to invention in a noted weed, but Mr. Collins' criticism does not elucidate the point.

Then with regard to the flower parallelism. As a lawyer, I must, according to Mr. Collins, be constitutionally insensible of what relates to æsthetic, but when I find in one work written, "Lillies of all kinds, the flower de luce being one," and in another, "Flower de luce and lillies of all natures," and in the one, "For you there's rosemary and rue, these keep seeming and savour all the winter long," and in the other, "You must take such things as are green all winter, rosemary, lavender, etc.," it seems to me an instance of a man who on each occasion of naming certain flowers, cannot well avoid recalling and naming the attributes associated with them in his memory. There are parallels of this sort by the hundred.

I regret that Mr. Collins' prepossessions have been too much for him. He has all the advantages of a high priest of literature. The entire press is open to him just as in the days before Luther the high priests of religion had the full command of the pulpits and the control of governments. Mr. Collins can fulminate against our views and suggest all sorts of deficiencies in our brain tissue, either from the cover of anonymous journalism, or in the signed essay. Now he is in the open I hope he will stay there, and in good time see the error of his ways. It is not his fault any more than it was Dr. Johnson's that he did not grasp the situation at the outset. Lord St. Alban has been too subtle for him, and misled him and many others by "style." "Shakespeare," said Mr. Collins, "attempted several styles, he excelled in all." Bacon, in his acknowledged writings, said, "Style is as the subject matter." In the cipher story he says, "I varied my



style to suit different men, since no two shew the same taste and like imagination.” Style in order to afford concealment had to be thorough in those days. His life almost depended upon it. In the address to Elizabeth in his “Masque of the Indian Prince,” there are two significant lines :—

“To her thy son must make his sacrifice  
If he will have the morning of his eyes.”

The anonymous “Arte of English Poesie,” 1589 (I object to it being attributed to one Puttenham as being mere conjecture), likewise gives some useful information on the subject of style, “many times natural to the writer, many times his peculiar by election and arte, and such as he either keepeth by skill or holdeth on by ignorance, and will not, or peradventure cannot, very easily alter into any other.” Mr. Collins has drifted into the belief that Bacon had no other style than that of his serious writings. The anonymous writer of “Papp with a Hatchet” (1589), alluding to Martin Marprelate, said very truly, “Faith thou wilt be caught by the style.”

Mr. Churton Collins is netted in similar toils, but his strong common-sense may eventually emancipate him.

PARKER WOODWARD.

---

How constantly one is misled by the assumption that incontestible proofs will change mens opinions. Where there exist strong prepossessions no amount of evidence produces any effect.—*Herbert Spencer.*

## WHEN DID FRANCIS BACON DIE? WHERE WAS HE BURIED?

**A**CCORDING to Dr. Rawley, Francis Bacon's chaplain and faithful friend,

"He died on the 9th day of April, 1626, in the early morning of the day then celebrated for our Saviour's resurrection, in the 66th year of his age, at the Earl of Arundel's house in Highgate, near London, to which place he casually repaired a week before. God so ordaining that he should die there of a gentle fever, accompanied with a great cold, whereby the defluxion of rheum fell so plentifully on his breast that he died of suffocation, and was buried in St. Michael's Church, at St. Albans, being the place designed for his burial by his last will and testament, both because the body of his mother was entered there, and because it was the only church then remaining within the precincts of Old Verulam; where he hath a monument erected for him in white marble (by the care and gratitude of Sir Thomas Meautys, Knight, formerly his lordship's secretary, afterwards clerk of the King's Honourable Privy Council under two kings), representing his full portraiture in the posture of studying, with an inscription composed by that accomplished gentleman and rare wit, Sir Henry Wootton."

Dr. Rawley's account of Bacon's death and burial is therefore confirmed both by Sir Thomas Meautys and Sir Henry Wootton.

The event became immediately known. A letter is extant written on April 10th, the day next after Bacon's death, by Sir Benjamin Rudyard, from Whitehall, to Sir Francis Nethersole, in which the writer says, "My Lo' St. Albans is dead, so is Sir Thomas Compton."—(*State Papers, Domestic, Charles I.* Vol. 24.)

John Aubrey, in his "Miscellanies," published 1696, writes:—

"Mr. Hobbes told me the cause of his Lordship's death was trying an experiment. As he was taking the aire in a coach with Dr. Witherborne (a Scotchman, Physician to the King)

towards Highgate, snow lay on the ground and it came into my Lord's thought, why flesh might not be preserved in snow as in salt. They were resolved they would try the experiment presently. They alighted out of the coach, and went into a poor woman's house at the bottom of Highgate Hill and bought a hen, and made the woman exenterate it, and then stuffed the body with snow, and my Lord did help to doe it himselfe. The snow so chilled him, that he immediately fell so extremely ill, that he would not return to his lodgings (I suppose them at Gray's Inne) but went to the Earle of Arundell's house at Highgate, where they putt him into a good bed warmed with a panne; but it was a damp bed that had not been layn in above a yeare before, which gave him such a cold that in 2 or three dayes as I remember he (Mr. Hobbes) told me he dyed of suffocation."

Mr. Hobbes was one of Bacon's most intimate literary friends. He confirms Dr. Rawley's account with additional details.

A letter from Bacon to Lord Arundel, written during his illness, from Lord Arundel's house, is printed in Spedding's "Life."

Francis Bacon's Will, dated 19th December, 1625, was proved on 13th July, 1627, by Sir Robert Rich and Sir Thomas Meautys, to whom, as Creditors, Letters of Administration were granted, the Executors named in the Will having been cited and renouncing probate. To obtain Letters of Administration the Administrators must have made oath of the Testator's death. It was not then the practice to file the affidavit leading the grant, and it is not extant, but Sir Robert Rich and Sir Thomas Meautys must have sworn to the fact of his death. His widow married again shortly after his death; of the fact of his death she must have been well assured.

Some years later, in 1634, an "Inquisition post mortem" was held, according to the practice of the period, to ascertain of what real estate Francis Viscount of St. Albans died seized.\*

\* For this Inquisition I am indebted to Mrs. Kindersley's research.



### The Inquisition was

"taken at Chipping Barnett in the County of Hertford on the 15th day of October in the 10th year of the reign of our Lord Charles by the grace of God of England Scotland France and Ireland King defender of the faith etc., before Richard Luchin Esquire Escheator of the said Lord the King of the aforesaid county, by virtue of the said Lord the King's etter of Mandamus addressed to the same Escheator and annexed to the Inquisition, for enquiry after the death of the very noble Francis Lord Bacon late Viscount of St Albans deceased by the oath of Roger Marshe gentleman John Howe John Perkin John Clark George Barley John Hill Daniel Hudson Thomas Potter Nicholas Pratt Robert Clarke Joseph Dolton John Pettett Thomas Grubb William Archer Thomas Browne and John Leonard, trustworthy and lawful men of the aforesaid county, who being sworn say upon their aforesaid oath, that the aforesaid Francis Viscount of St. Albans on the day before his death was seized in his demesne and in fee of and in the Manors of Gorhambury Westwicke and Praye with their rights members and appurtenances, and of and in 12 Messuages 3 Mills, 6 Pigeon houses 12 Gardens 1200 acres of land 100 acres of meadow 40 acres of wood and view of frankpledge in the parishes of St Michael St Stephen St Peter St Alban and in Redburne and Hemsteed in the said County of Hertford. and of and in the advowsons of the vicarages of the Churches of St Michael and Redburne aforesaid."

The Inquisition then sets out the settlement of this property made on his marriage with Alice Barnham, by which the same property was settled on his wife for life, and in the event of her surviving him, then to Trustees named in the Will.

"And further the aforesaid jurors say upon their aforesaid oath, that the aforesaid Francis Viscount of St. Albans being thus as is set out seized of and in all and singular the aforesaid manors and other premises with appurtenances at the aforesaid Gorhambury in the said County of Hertford died thus seized in such his estate on the 9th day of April 1626 without heirs of his body lawfully begotten, and that Thomas Bacon Esquire is and at the time of his death was the relative and next heir of the same Francis Viscount of St Albans and was at the time of the

death of the said Viscount of the age of twenty-six years and more. And that the aforesaid Alice Viscountess of St Albans is surviving and is in full life."

The Inquisition further states that the property is worth yearly beyond charges £25, that, from the time of the death of the aforesaid Francis Viscount of St. Albans until the taking of the Inquisition, the aforesaid Alice Viscountess of St. Albans had been in possession and receipt of the rents, and that the aforesaid Francis Viscount of St. Albans had no other landed estate.

The Inquisition is sealed by the Escheator and by the Jurors, and was handed into Court on 18th Oct., 10th Charles 1st.

We have here the oaths of 16 "trustworthy and lawful men" of the County of Hertford confirming the statement of Dr. Rawley, Sir Thomas Meautys, Sir Henry Wootton, Mr. Hobbes, Sir Benjamin Rudyerd, and Sir Robert Rich, that Francis Bacon died on 9th April, 1626, and explaining the devolution of his property upon and since his death.

Thomas Fuller, in his "Worthies of England," written in 1661 and published in 1662, thus writes of Francis Bacon's death:—

"He died Anno domini 1626 in the house of the Earl of Arundel at Highgate, and was buried in St Michael's Church in St Albans, Master Mutis his grateful servant erecting a monument for him. Since I have read that his grave being occasionally opened, his scule (the relic of civil veneration) was by one King, a doctor of physick, made the object of scorn and contempt; but he who then derided the dead is and will become the laughing stock of the living."

The date of 9th April, 1626, for Bacon's death is adopted without question by all his biographers, and can scarcely be displaced by the suggestion, unsupported by evidence, that a Rosicrucian Father lived to the age of 106, and a conjecture that he may have been Francis Bacon.

The late Earl of Verulam's statement, that the coffin was not discovered in the vaults of St. Michael's Church, seems insufficient evidence against the positive statement of contemporaries that the burial took place there in accordance with the directions of his will. The interment may have been in the churchyard, but according to Fuller, the grave was since opened and Bacon's skull found.

That Bacon's last illness occurred at Lord Arundel's house at Highgate appears well established. It is probable, however, that his physician, Dr. Parry, would be summoned from London to attend him, and it is possible that, when the seriousness of the illness became apparent, he may have been removed to Dr. Witherborne's house near Highgate, where he might be better nursed. This, though but a conjecture, might account for the varying accounts said to be given of the place of Francis Bacon's death, which accounts I have been unable to verify or trace. Fuller agrees with Dr. Rawley's account.



## BACON OF LONDON AS TIMON OF ATHENS.

IT seems a fitting moment, when Mr. J. H. Leigh has put *Timon of Athens* so intelligently and picturesquely on the stage of the Court Theatre, to draw attention to facts that make Baconians claim Bacon of London as the real author and principal figure of the play. Brandes naïvely protests how utterly at a loss he is to find any parallel in the life of Shakespeare to the incidents therein recorded.

He strains his points and endeavours in each play to find imagined resemblances to personal details in

William's biography, but at last Timon proves too much for him. He confesses it as follows :—

"In all the obscurity of Shakespeare's life-story nowhere do we feel our ignorance of his personal experiences more acutely than here."—"Critical Study of William Shakespeare," G. Brandes (Heinemann, 1898).

Francis St. Alban was deprived of the seals and committed to the Tower in May, 1621. In 1623 he was compelled to sell his beloved York House; his poverty, but not his will consenting. *Timon*, Gervinus tells us, was "without doubt one of the Poet's latest works," while Brandes also states it was first printed in the Folio of 1623. Those who have followed the tale of Bacon's woes and noted how his false friends, Sir George Hastings and Sir Richard Young, lied at his trial and at his sick bed, and brought him to shame; how friends on whom he had lavished his money and his friendship deserted him at his most need—must confess the closeness of the parallel between the open-handed Athenian, Timon, and the open-hearted Londoner, Bacon.

I quote what Thomas Bushell says, his loving and faithful servant, who, a gentleman of fortune, alone, with the exception of Meautys, among his secretaries and *attachés* seems to have clung to him with an affectionate tenacity as touching as that of honest *Flavius*. Bushell's letter, addressed to Mr. John Eliot, is published in a book called, "*The Superlative Prodigal*," London, 1668.

"The ample testing of your true affection towards My Lord Verulam, Viscount St. Albans, hath obliged me your servant. Yet, lest calamitous tongues of men might exterminate the good opinion you had of his worth and merit, I must ingenuously confess myself and others of his servants were the occasion of exhaling his virtues into a dark eclipse, which God knows could not have long endured both for the honour of his king, and good



of the commonalitie, had not one whom his bounty nursed, laid on his guiltless shoulders our bare and execrable deeds to be scorned and censured by the whole Senate of a State where no sooner sentence was given, but most of us forsook him, which makes us bear the badge of Jews to this day."

In this spontaneous confession of Bushell we read the truth. Where he looked for gratitude or return for kindness, he found desertion and ingratitude, the hardest sting of all.

In Vol. X. of *Baconiana*, New Series, 1902, I gave a brief sketch of "Arthur Wilson." On page 9 is a short account of Lord St. Alban by Wilson:—

"He had a sickly taste, and he did not like the beer of the house, but sent to Sir Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke, in neighbourhood for a bottle of his beer, and after some grumbling the butler had orders to deny him. So sordid was the one that advanced himself to be called Sir Phillip Sidnie's friend, and so friendless was the other after he had dejected himself from what he was."

Stage Timon differently. Let the scene be York House. The time 1616-1623. Let Timon be represented as Francis Bacon, and no one could fail to see the likeness of the hero of the play to the man we hold to have been its author.

Naturally the Poet being the man he was, and holding the mirror up to the faults of Man, painted Timon without the divine philosophy he himself possessed. Prospero, rather than Timon, in his fall he called Divine Reason to his aid. Instead of giving way to weakness he found strength in sorrow. And instead of falling into a frenzy and encouraging morbid rancour and misanthrophy, he bore his sorrows with nobility. Possibly, as Gervinus suggests, the subject of the play was "taken up under a temporary feeling of vexation and disappointment." But Bacon's love for mankind was never soured or embittered, and

Bushell\* and Meautys, as we know, were his "fellows" to the end. Bushell gives us a curious little bit of "Timonian" evidence. He writes in a letter to "My only Lord,"

"I am resolved to become your Lordship's bondsman in some solitary cell, and endeavour to make myself worthy of your Honour's company in the other world."

Bushell retired to the Isle of Lundy, moated about by the sea, walled by "inaccessible rocks," and fed on herbs and such like simple diet. The *Dictionary of National Biography* has much to say about him. At 15 he entered Francis Bacon's service. The gorgeousness of his attire attracted the attention of the king when he accompanied Bacon to court as Lord Chancellor.

After Bacon's supposed death he lived in "the desolated island called the Calf of Man" on a "parsimonious diet of herbs and oil, mustard and honey, with water sufficient, most like to that of our long-lived fathers before the flood." This brings forcibly to everyone's memory Timon's last resting place, a solitary cell by the rocky sea shore, and his occupation, digging for roots. Bushell says he waited for the "funeral pomp" to be over ere retiring "with a man" to Lundy. I commit Timon to the earnest study of all Baconians.

A. A. LEITH.

\* See BACONIANA, Vol IX., pp. 43—48, article on Thomas Bushell.

## THE NIGHT OF ERRORS AT GRAY'S INN.

**A**N article by Mrs. C. C. Stopes, in the *Athenæum*, of 30th April last, is one of those amusing exercises on "Possibilities and Probabilities," which the upholders of the player "Shakespeare" offer as arguments to show that he wrote the plays. Faced by the fact that Kempe, Shakespeare, and Burbage presented a comedy before Queen Elizabeth at Greenwich, on the same day that the *Comedy of Errors* was played at Gray's Inn, viz., Innocent's Day, 28th December, 1594. Mrs. Stopes says:—

"This discovery was, to say the least of it, discouraging, until it dawned on me that the second performance at Greenwich was said to have taken place 'on Innocent's Day' not 'on Innocent's Day *at night*' as was usual. A day performance might give time for the players, with good horses, to find themselves in London by the late hour suggested in the story of the revels, after all the confusion, and at least some of the dancing."

She suggests that the play at Greenwich was the *Comedy of Errors*, that the players rode up in, or with, their costumes, that the Earl of Southampton, a member of Gray's Inn, had supper with them, then went to the revels, and, on confusion arising there, slipped out and brought the players to repeat at Gray's Inn the comedy which they had performed the same day at Greenwich! There is no evidence whatever to support any of these suggestions. An account of the revels is given in "Gesta Grayorum" set out in Nichol's "Progresses of Queen Elizabeth," Vol III., p. 262, and also to be found in the library of Gray's Inn. Mrs. Stopes cites passages from this work, and refers to the arraignment of the

"conjurer" who was charged by the revellers with having brought "base, and common fellows" in to play. Strangely enough, she does not seem to suggest that Southampton was the conjurer, and less strangely she does not care to conjecture who this conjurer was. He is anonymous in the "Gesta," but is referred to there in the following terms: "The next night upon this occasion, we preferred judgments thick and three-fold, which were read publicly by the clerk of the Crown, being all against a sorcerer or conjurer that was supposed to be the cause of that confused inconvenience. Therein was contained, how he had caused the stage to be built, and scaffolds to be reared to the top of the house, to increase expectation. Also how he had caused divers ladies and gentlemen, and others of good condition to be invited to our sports; also our dearest friend the *State of Templariá*, to be disgraced, and disappointed of their kind entertainment, deserved and intended. Also that he caused throngs and tumults, crowds and outrages, to disturb our whole proceedings. And lastly, that he had foisted a company of base and common fellows, to make up our disorders with a play of Errors and Confusions; and that that night had gained to us discredit, and itself a nickname of Errors . . ." The prisoner was arraigned at the bar, and on being tried presented a petition "wherein was a disclosure of all the knavery and juggling of the Attorney and Solicitor, which had brought all this law-stuff on purpose to blind the eyes of his Excellency"—the Prince of Purpoole—"and all the honourable Court there, going about to make them think that those things which they all saw and perceived sensibly to be in very deed done, and actually performed, were nothing else but vain illusions, fancies, dreams, and enchantments, and to be wrought and compassed by the means of a poor harmless wretch, that never had heard of such great



matters in all his life : whereas the very fault was in the negligence of the Prince's Council, Lords, and Officers of his state that had the rule of the roast, and by whose advice the commonwealth was so soundly misgoverned. To prove these things to be true, he brought divers instances of great absurdities committed by the greatest; and made such allegations as could not be denied . . . and thereupon the prisoner was freed and pardoned, the Attorney, Solicitor, Master of the Requests, and those acquainted with the draught of the petition, were all of them commanded to the Tower; so the Lieutenant took charge of them. And this was the end of our law-sports, concerning the *Night of Errors*."

Our readers will not refrain from wondering who was this unnamed "conjurer" of such influence at Gray's Inn that he could "cause a stage to be built, and scaffolds to be reared to the top of the house, and guests 'of good condition' to be invited, and himself to be honourably acquitted, and his accusers condemned for the confusion of the entertainment. Was it Proteus of the following Shrove-tide masque at Court by the Gray's Inn revellers, or Prospero of the *Tempest*, or Mr. Francis Bacon, a Bencher of the Inn?"

J. R., of Gray's Inn.

---

## THE *FLEUR DE LYS*.

**A**MONG the many symbols which appear in mediæval literature, either in the form of printer's ornament or watermark, one of the most frequent is the *Fleur de Lys*. The *Fleur de Lys* or Flower of Lewis was adopted by Lewis VII. (1137—1180) as an emblem of the national standard. Charles VI. in 1365 reduced the number of the flowers to three,

the mystical number of The Church. Guillim, in his "Display of Heraldrie," 1610, states that the device is:—"Three toads erect, saltant," in allusion to which Nostradamus, in the sixteenth century, had already called Frenchmen *crapauds* (toads). Nevertheless, the *Fleur de Lys* was chosen by Flavio Gioja to become the permanent mark of the north point of the compass, as a compliment to the then King of Naples, who was of French descent.

As to the meaning of the symbolic *Fleur de Lys*. Lewis VII. scattered these emblems of the Trinity broadcast over his standards to resemble the starry heavens, and to indicate the blessings of this and the next world to be gained under his standards. Charles VI., who, as his sad end proved, had a fatal leaning to mysticism, reduced the number to Three, whereby the meaning of the *Fleur de Lys* becomes considerably increased.

According to Protius, Three is the first perfect number, a middle, and an analogy. The Pythagoreans, and also their indirect and, in principle much diversified, successors, the Brethren of the Rose Croix, read the Book of Nature, and referred to Physiology all that pertains to the Microcosm. Thus, with them, the triad is chiefly concerned with triple dimensions and the triangle figures as the chiefest and most perfect principle of Geometry. Logic claims the Triad as the finite number of the necessary terms. Astrology counts 3 Quaternions of celestial signs, and in every zodiacal sign 3 Faces, 3 Decans, and 3 Lords of their triplicity. Among the planets, again, there are numbered 3 Fortunes and 3 Infortunes. Music counts in Harmony 3 Symphonies: Diapason, Diapente and Diatessaron. Mythology tells of 3 Fates, 3 Furies, 3 Graces, 3 Judges of Hades, and Hesiod mentions the 3 Horæ: *Eunomia* (Order), *Dike* (Justice) and *Eirene* (Peace). Neptune's

weapon is a trident; Cerberus had 3 heads, and Jupiter's thunderbolt is triformis. Hecate is always triple. The letter Yod, of the Hebrew alphabet, within an equilateral triangle was the symbol of the ineffable name of Jehovah, and Shin, as the monogram of Jehovah has three rays.

Further, we get the Royal Arch sign, "the Triple Tau," 3 Stones of the Arch, 3 Principals and 3 Sojourners; 3 Veils; in the Craft Lodges, 3 officers, 3 degrees and 3 perambulations.

There is no system of worship in the world, but the Triad has its place. The Romans, the Celtic Druids, the Hindoos, and Norsemen with their three-rooted Ash Tree *Yggdrasil* and their three Norns (Fates), all have testified their strong belief in the inherent power and potent meaning of the number 3. Even to-day, there are 3 crossings with water in Baptism, 3 Creeds, 3 publications of the Banns of Marriage, and 3 signs of the Cross by a Bishop in benediction. The usher of a court of law 3 times repeats the Norman-French admonition: "*Oyez*," (listen!) The Irish Shamrock or Trefoil, the 3 legs, united at the hips, of the Isle of Man, and their origin, the Sicilian mariner's *Trinacria* are geographical vestiges of the mysterious attraction of the number three.

Enough has been said to show, that the symbolism of the number Three altogether depends upon its use and the nationality, and the status of the person who uses it.

WILLIAM KRISCH.

[We deeply regret to announce that Dr. Krisch died on May 29th, 1904. Dr. Krisch was in his 72nd year.—ED. "Baconiana."]

## THE BACON-SHAKESPEARE CONTROVERSY IN FRANCE.

[We have been favoured by the following notes. Our French correspondent requests us to revise his English, but our readers will certainly prefer the charm of the original.—ED.]

THE first time the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy has been seriously spoken about by French critics was, as far as I know, in the year 1885. A paper was written at first in the *Revue Internationale* (25 *Janvier*) by Mr. Franz Meyer, whose tendencies were evidently Baconian. But this was more or less a second-hand article, only summing up a larger one of Dr. Karl Müller-Mylius in the German review, *Unsere Zeit* (Octobre, 1884).

In the *Revue Britannique* (Mai, 1885), was issued a paper by Alexandre Büchner, a well-known Shakespearean scholar. The latter seemed,—though he does not say it,—to have borrowed much from the article of Franz Meyer. But he endeavours to refute it. His whole argumentation merely amounts to this, that :

1.—Shakspeare was not such an ignorant as the Baconians describe him.

2.—On the other hand, although the Plays are monuments of a very comprehensive genius, they do not bear witness to a wide amount of positive and exact knowledge. Shakspeare was therefore quite able to write them.

The article of Mr. Henry Cochin in the *Revue des Deux-Mondes* (1 *Novembre*, 1885), was a very moderate and erudite one, the style of which was much better than that of the two precedent. The writer is indeed anti-Baconian, but does not lose his time, like Mr. Büchner, in humouristic jottings about Mrs. Delia. In Mr. Henry Cochin's opinion, Heminge and Condell,



when they were publishing the First Folio, could not be mistaken in ascribing the Plays to Shakspeare, whose life and works they had always witnessed. But in spite of this conclusion, it would be easy to point out in that paper many statements which are nothing but the very starting-points of the Baconian system.

As the *Revue des Deux-Mondes* is looked upon as an authority by the whole French critic, it was thought a matter of course by every Frenchman that the Baconian theory was not worth speaking of. Moreover, it must be said that French poets, musicians and writers, like Victor Hugo, Alexandre Dumas, Berlioz, etc., had paid a kind of worship to Shakespeare during the 19th century. Therefore they were not likely to deny him the authorship of the Plays and to take away his statue from the Boulevard Haussmann. Thus there were no important writings about the Baconian controversy during a long time. A professor of English literature at the Sorbonne, Mr. A. Beljame, was once announcing he would deliver a series of lectures about that question; but he did not carry out his purpose.

Only in 1903 there was a new movement of Baconism in France. Since eighteen years, the English and American Baconians had gone much further in the matter; it was no more possible to be unacquainted with their works, or still to say all of them were but lunatic. The fortnightly review, *Etudes*, was the first to bring anew the controversy on the carpet with a series of articles, the first of which BACONIANA has been referring to (*cf.* BACONIANA, 1903, p. 192). The writer in the *Etudes*, although he did not agree with us in every point, showed himself to be aware of the question, and was in the whole a stickler for the theory.

A few weeks afterwards, Mr. Jean Carrère wrote in the *Revue hebdomadaire* (13 *Juin*, 1903) a paper, where he chiefly cut easy jokes on Mr. Edwin Bormann, and

graciously (as he probably means) sifted all the names the Baconians have ever been called by irascible gentlemen like Dr. Furnivall and Mr. Richard Grant White. Such arguments did not make up for his superficial knowledge of the controversy.

Quite different are the three papers written in the *Journal des Debats* (25 Août, 23 Septembre, 21 Octobre) by Mr. Auguste Filon, who is a man of true scholarship and perfect courtesy. He drew a very clear sketch of the matter, his mind being only in the third paper biassed by the Shakespearean worship, so as to say Francis Bacon was neither *une vaste intelligence* nor *une grande âme*! But he also sincerely made this statement: "The Baconian thesis has up to this day been asserted in presence of three successive generations by able and more sincere writers. . . . Such a controversy is therefore not disdainfully to be set aside nor *a priori* declared unworthy of consideration."

Only for memory may it be said that various less important articles have been written by Mr. E. Lepelletier in the *Echo de Paris* (1 Dec.), Henry Bidou, in the *Journal des Debats* (1 Juin), X. de R., in the *Renaissance Latine* (15 Octobre). To speak the truth, the most of them are unfavourable to the Baconian claims. But they cannot prevent the theory to be winning its way in France. As a proof, whereas all the French books about English literature did not speak of it a few years ago, they now generally find a room to a more or less large discussion of the controversy.

## SHAKSPER AND THE STRATFORD ENCLOSURES.

LEAVING on one side the question of to whom the world is indebted for the Shakespeare plays, it is remarkable how loth is the present age to admit its indebtedness to Lord Bacon. It is almost denied that he has any claim whatever upon the gratitude or respect of mankind, yet his career was a sustained protest against oppression, and a continual effort for the betterment of men's bread and wine. It is again the story of Orpheus being rent in pieces by the Bacchides; if the modern critic cannot rend, he prefers to take refuge in silence.

In Vol. III. p. 481, of that excellent work, "Social England," edited by H. D. Traill and J. S. Mann, and now in course of re-issue in an enlarged and revised form, there is a characteristic instance of injustice to Lord Bacon.

"It was perhaps by the efforts of Wm. Shakespeare, himself a commoner, that the attempt of the Lord of the Manor to enclose the common fields at Welcombe, near Stratford-on-Avon, was defeated" (!).

It is possible but highly improbable. The evidence, far from encouraging, is hostile to any such assumption, in fact, the assertion has rather "a countenance of gravity than any sincerity of truth." Biographers are in agreement that Shaksper was in all probability successfully bribed to abet an unscrupulous piece of land grabbing.

As stated by Halliwell-Phillipps, and again by Sidney Lee, the facts are briefly as follows. William Combe (the son of John Combe, "a notable usurer") attempted to enclose the common fields that belonged to the Corporation of Stratford. Acting in concert with

Combe was a neighbouring landowner, named Mainwaring. "The latter," says Halliwell-Phillipps, "who had been practically bribed by some land arrangements at Welcombe, undertook to protect the interests of Shaksper, so that there can be no doubt the three parties were acting in unison."

The Corporation of Stratford resolved to offer the scheme a stout resistance, and in formal meeting drew up a letter to Shaksper imploring his aid. "But," says Mr. Lee, "it is plain . . . he continued to lend Combe his countenance. Happily Combe's efforts failed, and the common lands remain unenclosed."

Had the writer written Shakespeare in inverted commas we could endorse his otherwise fanciful surmise. "Tell her," says Shakespeare, "my love, more noble than the world, prizes not quantity of dirty lands."\*

To Bacon it was due that in 1597 Parliament stepped in and put an end to the encroachment of landowners, and the unscrupulous eviction of small tenants. In the teeth of opposition, his propositions became law, and by good fortune a short report of the speech made in Parliament upon the occasion has come down to us. It runs thus :—

"Mr. Bacon made a motion *against depopulation of towns* and houses of husbandry, and for the maintenance of husbandry and tillage. And to this purpose he brought in two bills, as he termed it, not drawn with a polished pen, but with a polished heart. . . . And though it may be thought ill and very prejudicial to lords that have enclosed great grounds, and pulled down even whole towns, and converted them to sheep pastures, yet, considering the increase of people, and the benefit of the commonwealth, I doubt not, but every man will deem the revival of former moth-eaten laws in this point a praiseworthy thing. For in matters of policy ill is not to be thought ill, which bringeth forth good. For enclosure of grounds brings depopulation, which



brings forth first, idleness ; secondly, decay of tillage ; thirdly, subversion of homes, and decrease of charity, and charge to the poor's maintenance ; fourthly, the impoverishing the state of the realm. . . . And I should be sorry to see within this kingdom that piece of Ovid's verse prove true, *Jam seges est ubi Troja fuit* ; so in England, instead of a whole town full of people, none but green fields, but a shepherd and a dog.

"The eye of experience is the sure eye, but the eye of wisdom is the quick-sighted eye ; and by experience we daily see, *Nemo putat illud videri turpe quod sibi sit quæstuosum*. And, therefore, almost there is no conscience made in destroying the savour of our life, bread I mean, for *Panis sapor vitæ*. And, therefore, a sharp and vigorous law had need to be made against these *viperous* natures who fulfil the proverb, *Si non posse quod vult, velle tamen quod potest*."<sup>6</sup>

The writer of the Shakespeare plays seemingly had access to this speech, and assimilated Bacon's sentiments and phraseology.

In *Coriolanus* we find :—

*Sicinius*.—What is the city, but the people ?

*Citizens*.—True, the people are the city.

*Sicinius*.—Where is this viper that would depopulate the city ?

We are peremptory to despatch this *viperous* traitor.

(Act III., Sc. i.).

A comparison of this passage with Bacon's speech brings out the conjunction in both cases of "depopulation," "towns" and the curious word "viperous."

\* "Spedding," Vol. II., p. 82.

## REVIEWS.

**A**S a preventative to the insidious spread of Baconism, Mr. John Rowlands has written *Shakespeare Still Enthroned*.\* Mr. Rowlands observes :—

“Some may consider such a work unnecessary, and the author himself would have maintained that opinion a few years ago. But having met with persons of all classes, and students of all grades who fancy that Bacon was the real author, it is scarcely necessary to apologise for attempting to show, rather than assert, that the idea is preposterous. The knowledge which these people, however, possess of the above standard authors (Bacon and Shakespeare), their lives as well as their works, is seldom very thorough, and often superficial.”

Having acquired what he seemingly considers to be an adequate knowledge of the subject—derived apparently by the study of Macaulay’s *Essay*, and the casting of a transient eye upon Bacon’s *Essays*—Mr. Rowlands presents for our reprehension a lamentable picture of Lord Verulam’s turpitude. We can only repeat Spedding’s observation, that it is futile to write and disprove untruths if men decline to read the proofs, yet continue to reiterate their erroneous statements.

After, in Part I., exhibiting the broad-browed Verulam as an unrespectworthy character, Mr. Rowlands, in Part II., bids us regard a very different picture,—the gentle player, Mr. William Shaksper. Of contemporary testimony to Shaksper’s genial personality Mr. Rowlands maintains there is abundance. He cites as evidence the hackneyed passage from Spenser’s *Tears of the Muses* :—

“Spenser’s testimony is doubly interesting, his lines having reference to Shakespear’s general disposition no less than to his genius. He writes :—

\*94 pp., Crown 8vo. London, 1/6

'The man whom Nature's self had made  
To mock herself and truth to imitate,  
With kindly counter, under mimic shade,'

while in the next line he speaks of this author 'as our pleasant Willy.' "

Mr. Rowlands should really have completed the quotation of which the final line runs :—

"Our pleasant Willy, ah, *is dead* of late !"

Spenser died in 1598 or 1599, Shaksper not until 1616. How, therefore, the recently deceased "Willy" can be identified with the Swan of Avon has always passed our comprehension.

The theory by which Mr. Rowlands accounts for the premature withdrawal of the prosperous actor to the foetid surroundings of Stratford is that "his work was nearly done, and he retired, having, so to speak, exhausted his soul." The reason why we possess no scrap of Shakespeare MS. is probably the disastrous fire which destroyed the Globe Theatre in 1613. Ten years later Messrs. Heminge and Condell asserted that they had collected Shaksper's "true originall copies," and that they then, in 1623, had them in their possession, —but this is a detail, and it seems pedantic to spoil so ingenious and well-worn a Shakespearean fiction.

The Baconian theory Mr. Rowlands deems "a monstrosity of mental delusion such as no man with an even balanced mind can believe." He is transported into an ecstasy by the intellectual beauty of the Droeshout portrait. This and the sublimity of the Stratford Bust inspire him to perorate as follows :—

"In conclusion, we may be excused for drawing the reader's attention to the dramatist's portrait as being expressive of great genius. The portrait by Martin Droeshout, prefixed to the edition of 1623, when Shakespeare's countenance was still fresh and clear to the minds of editors and readers alike, impresses us greatly

with the grandeur of its features, and in particular with the abnormal and altogether magnificent development of the forehead, the large, luminous eyes being full of inspiration and love. The lines which follow it with the signature 'B. J.' (Ben Jonson) attest the faithfulness of the picture. The bust at Stratford, by Gerard Johnson, erected after the dramatist's death, is of the same character, and a sufficient proof of the genuineness of the likeness, which is the grandest face in all the splendid gallery of our great men. It is a noble, perfect countenance; we could not conceive of it being different. It is suggestive of all that is great, and all that is beautiful in the being of man, a glorious mirror of a glorious soul."

This is the same wonderful work of art of which Mrs. Stopes writes (*Monthly Review*, April, 1904): "There is an entire lack of the faintest suggestion of poetic or spiritual inspiration in its plump earthliness. The designer has put a pen and paper into his hands, after the manner of the schoolboy, who wrote under his drawing of something-on-four-legs, 'This is a horse.' The pen strives to write 'This is a literary man,' but there is nothing to support the attribution."

It evidently all depends upon the colour of the spectacles one wears when gazing on the counterfeit presentment of the man of Stratford.

---

In his *Table Talk* William Hazlitt observes:—

"If we wish to know the force of human genius, we should read Shakespeare. If we wish to see the insignificance of human learning, we may study his commentators."

We are reminded of this remark by Mr. Canning's *Shakespeare Studied in Eight Plays*.<sup>\*</sup> Lest it be imagined that we are unjust or hypercritical, we clip a portion of the critique which appeared in the *Morning Leader*:—

"In a prefatory note to this portly volume the author explains

<sup>\*</sup> "Shakespeare Studied in Eight Plays," by the Hon. Albert S. G. Canning. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1903. 16s. net.



that it is not intended for Shakespearean scholars, but 'simply to render the eight plays treated of more interesting and intelligible to general readers.' It is always sad that what has evidently been a considerable labour, and as evidently a labour of love, should be worthless when accomplished. It may be that some readers whose lack of dramatic instinct makes Shakespeare seem 'uninteresting and unintelligible' will have some obstacles removed from their path by Mr. Canning's method of exposition. That method is to take eight plays—*Troilus and Cressida*, *Timon of Athens*, *Julius Cæsar*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Richard III.*, *Henry VIII.*, *King Lear*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*—and follow them scene by scene, and almost line by line, with what are practically minute and laborious stage-directions. When Wolse breaks into his memorable outburst,

'O Cromwell, Cromwell !  
Had I but served my God with half the zeal  
I served my king, He would not in mine age  
Have left me naked to mine enemies ;'

and Cromwell breaks in with, 'Good sir, have patience'—most people will feel that it is superfluous to be told that Cromwell is 'naturally trying to calm his sudden agitation.' Yet this is not an unfair specimen of Mr. Canning's method."

It would be superfluous to add to this excellent comment.

---

In *Shakespeare and the Rival Poet*\* Mr. Acheson essays to prove "that Professor Minto's conjecture as to Chapman's identity as the 'Rival Poet' is absolutely true."

From the same data I shall prove the truth of the contention of the Southamptonites ; I shall throw an altogether new light on *Love's Labour's Lost* and *Troilus and Cressida*, and give a definite date for their production and their revision ; I shall show

\* "Shakespeare and the Rival Poet : displaying Shakespeare as a Satirist and proving the Identity of the Patron and the Rival of the Sonnets," by Arthur Acheson. London and New York : John Lane. 5/- net.

the truth of very interesting internal evidence in the Sonnets, which has hitherto been quite misunderstood or altogether unnoticed, and shall set forth a fairly definite date for their production.

Although we cannot accept all Mr. Acheson's conclusions, his work is an able piece of inductive reasoning, modestly and agreeably presented. Mr. Acheson supports the personal theory of the Sonnets, he believes that Holofernes in *Love's Labour Lost* and Thersites in *Troilus and Cressida* are portrait caricatures of George Chapman, and he suggests that the lines :—

“Fair Diomed, you do as chapmen do,”

and

“Beauty is bought by judgment of the eye,  
Not uttered by base sale of chapmen's tongues,”

are veiled allusions tending to support his theory.

The fact that Mr. Acheson dates from Chicago, probably accounts for his reference to the Baconian theory as being dead. In this country it has never been more healthy.

---

We have received an edition of Bacon's *Essays*, edited by Mr. Edward Wright, and published by Messrs. Methuen & Co. This volume we can cordially recommend to the attention of Baconians for its able and fair introduction and notes, and for a pure text adopted from that of Mr. Aldis Wright. We have here the best short summary of Bacon's *life* that has come under our notice, and its value is enhanced by a succinct appendix, entitled, “The First Three Dedications, and a Bibliographical Note on the Essays,” a valuable supplement to Dr. Arber's “Parallel” edition of the *Essays*,—the most useful ever printed.

But Mr. Wright is not *altogether* a Baconian, although

he is singularly fair in his view of the "Controversy." This is what he says :—

"The popular question as to whether or not Shakespeare and Bacon were the same writer is not an entirely unprofitable subject for discussion. It may, perhaps, serve to inform those who have studied neither their works nor their lives, that the greatest English dramatist and the greatest English prose-writer were men of almost equal genius, who lived in the same age, and submitted to much the same influence, so that they necessarily have some scattered thoughts, and even scattered expressions in common. It is not at all improbable that Shakespeare, like lesser men, 'conveyed' passages from Bacon's works when they circulated in manuscript."

We would say it was most improbable, unless Mr. Wright admits that the complete manuscripts of the Shakespearean plays were borrowed *in toto* by Shakspeare from Bacon, the lower-life and tap-room passages being supplied by the actor for the benefit of the "penny knaves" in the pit of the Globe Theatre.

Mr. Wright, fair as he is, can scarcely have studied the Bacon-Shakespeare argument, when he refers to the "scattered thoughts" and "scattered expressions" common to the two authors. The thoughts and expressions are not "scattered," they are as "thick as leaves in Vallambrosa." No two men ever lived in the history of the world at the same time, who re-echoed each other "thoughts" and "expressions" so powerfully, so conclusively, as Francis Bacon and William Shakespere. "It is," says David Masson, "as if into a mind poetical in *form* there had been poured all the *matter* that existed in the mind of his (Shakespeare's) contemporary Bacon. In Shakespeare's plays we have thought, history, exposition, philosophy, all within the round of the poets. The only difference between him and Bacon sometimes is that Bacon writes an essay and calls it his own, while Shakespeare writes a similar

essay, and puts it into the mouth of a Ulysses or a Polonius."\*

---

MR. W. C. HAZLITT ON MR. S.  
LEE AND THE BACONIANS.

MR. SIDNEY LEE is not faring so well at the hands of the critics. Mr. W. Carew Hazlitt, in the new edition of his *Shakespeare: Himself and his work*, rubs it well into the standard biographer. Here are a few extracts:—

"It is essential for a literary inquirer, even of the exalted pretensions of Mr. Lee, if he introduces such particulars, to study accuracy and truth. He [Mr. Lee] fails to do so here, and I shall have occasion to show that it is an habitual fault."

"That gentleman has not only dealt incompletely with some biographical points from an imperfect acquaintance, I presume, with the data, or an inadequate valuation of their importance, but he has left numerous others absolutely untouched."

"It is not unjust to this gentleman to affirm that, had it not been for the generous perseverance of Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps, the *Life of Shakespeare* by Mr. Lee could not have been even what we see it. As it is, the work is imperfect and inaccurate enough, and even where Mr. Lee had the advantage of his predecessor's volumes at his elbow, he has not always translated their sense quite correctly or faithfully; nor has he by any means fully profited by the opportunity supplied by other readily accessible stores of information."

"The literary speculator, of whom Mr. Lee does not impress me with the notion of knowing much, was immensely before his time, according to Sidney Lee, whose childish census [of the *First Folios*] has recently fallen under my eyes."

Pretty severe this from one Shakespearean to another !  
Mr. Hazlitt has not forgotten the Baconians, whose

\* Wordsworth, Shelley, Keats, and other Essays, 1874. Essay V., p. 242. Reprinted from *North British Review*, 1853.



opinions he describes as "this unparalleled heresy," "failure to grasp all the facts," "a more or less diffused creed," &c., and yet Mr. Hazlitt acknowledges that "the Baconian theory may nevertheless have some measure of verisimilitude," saying, "I harbour the opinion, an empirical and diffident one, I allow, that such as the first drafts of *Henry IV.*, *Henry V.*, and *Henry VI.*, were *not improbably* of Baconian origin, far more probably, indeed, than from the pens usually named in connection with them, and that these products of a man of genius, wholly destitute of the stoical experience beyond such as sufficed to set forth a Court or Gray's Inn pageant, were laid before the practical artist even without a clue to the authorship, in a reviewer's transcript." A remarkable admission from a Shakespearean, truly. And again, according to Hazlitt, "1580—82, for instance, in an almost blank interval, during which he [Bacon] may have occupied his time with dramatic experiments." "There are indications," we are informed, that the composition of the historical series, commencing with *Henry IV.*, had already started in 1587, before Shakspear entered on the scene, and when Bacon was very young. What Bacon may have written of this nature we are quite authorized [by whom?] to conclude unfit for theatrical use; but the first drafts of *Henry IV.*, *V.*, *VI.*, were possibly his, yet not even as they were originally exhibited and published, but submitted to a revising pen. "If that pen was Shakspear's, we are unable to believe that he engaged in this kind of work prior to 1590, and thenceforward during some years he did little else in a dramatic direction." So that four years after leaving Stratford we have the *experienced* lad of Stratford revising the plays of the *inexperienced* Francis Bacon.

Then we have Mr. Hazlitt's admission:—

"That Bacon, situated as he was in constant and anxious

expectation of loyal advancement, did not venture to associate himself publicly with such performances, had they even been capable of utilization as he left them, is perfectly obvious."

Just what Baconians have always maintained.

Mr. Hazlitt concludes as follows :—

"It had always struck us as extraordinary, and almost as a problem to be explained, how the two greatest Englishmen belonged to one era, nearly to the same interval of years, how they lived, as it were, side by side, face to face, yet, so far as we could learn, were strangers to each others: one a poetical philosopher, the other a philosophical poet, and at length, according to some, the mystery is unravelled, the veil is rent asunder, and not Stratford, but Gorhambury, is entitled to the glory of being the first village in the world. A Cathedral City without a Bishop, a shrine with relics canonized by no Church, only by the voice of all educated mankind."

Very well put, Mr. Hazlitt.

G. S.

---

## NOTES, QUERIES, AND CORRESPONDENCE.

### The Stratford Bust.

IN the April No. of *The Monthly Review*, Mrs. Charlotte C. Stopes has an interesting article on the Stratford Bust. She produces evidence chiefly in the form of illustrations from Dugdale's "*Warwickshire*" and other early sources, tending to show that the monument has been "restored" out of recognition. In the earliest pictorial representation (Dugdale, 1656) the attitude and features are quite different to their present form. "Far from resembling the self-contented, fleshy man of to-day, the large and full dark eyes look out of cheeks hollow to emaciation." Mrs. Stopes is of the opinion—seemingly well founded—that it was "the

sculptor who collaborated with Hall in 1746 who deprived us of the original outlines of a memorial so dear, either through ignorance, vanity, or culpable carelessness." As a consequence, the present bust "in its plump earthliness" is in all probability purely a fancy portrait.

It is a great pity that Mrs. Stopes mars so much of her excellent research work by the intrusion of romantic imagination. Referring to the early Dugdale reproduction, she observes :—"In it there is something biographical, something suggestive; it shows us the tired creator of poems, exhausted from lack of sleep, 'Nature's sweet restorer,' weary of the bustling London life, who had returned as soon as possible to seek rest among his own people, and met an over early death in the unhealthy spring-damps of 1616."

Whence does Mrs. Stopes get this information about "the unhealthy spring-damps of 1616"? Mr. Sidney Lee merely mentions that "according to the testimony of John Ward, the vicar, Shakespeare entertained at New Place his two friends Michael Drayton and Ben Jonson in this same spring of 1616, and 'had a merry meeting,' but 'itt seems drank too hard, for Shakespeare died of a feavour there contracted.'"

### Lord Macaulay.

**D**URING the past few months Macaulay has fared unhappily at the hands of various writers. Lord Acton's views are quoted elsewhere. From the newly published Carlyle letters, we learn that Carlyle's estimation was not flattering. He sums up Macaulay as—

"The sublime of the commonplace, not one of whose ideas has the least tincture of greatness and originality or any kind of superior merit, except neatness of expression."

A harsh sidelight on the famous talker is cast from the diary of the late Thomas Creevey, M.P.\*

"Yesterday I dined at Stanley's. Mr. Macaulay and Mr. Jordon were the only performers after dinner, and two more noisy, vulgar fellows I never saw."

---

### Sir Edward Clarke.

**S**PEAKING on St. George's Day at a Savage Club "House" dinner, Sir Edward Clarke referred unsympathetically to the Baconian theory. He conceded, however, that "there were certain parts of some of the accepted plays of Shakespeare which nothing in the world would induce him to believe that Shakespeare wrote."

Sir Edward commented upon the thorough grasp displayed by Shakespeare of every department of life, and added, "It was a mystery. No intelligible explanation could be given for the knowledge which was invested into every part of those plays."

This is somewhat disrespectful to Mr. Churton Collins, Mr. Sidney Lee and other experts who have provided "explanations" for all and every difficulty.

Sir Edward Clarke does not appear to regard the professional critic with that awe which is evinced by the general press. We recall, with amusement, the passage at arms which took place in the columns of *The Times* in December, 1902. Sir Edward put his point thus:—

"Mr. ———, at a large public gathering, obtained an after-dinner laugh by speaking of me as 'a certain prominent advocate who did not always confine himself to his own business,' and he seems to think that no one is entitled to discuss literary subjects who does not earn his living in the profession of letters. It is a ridiculous claim. The literature of England is a fair and spacious domain, and it does not belong to Mr. ———. He is

\* *The Creevey Papers*. Edited by Sir H. Maxwell (Murray).



rather like the intelligent rustic whose business it is to open one of the gates. It is a useful occupation, and I do not grudge Mr. ——— its rewards. But I have not used that entrance, and I know the estate well enough to find my way about it without his assistance. In a pontifical manner he, as the representative of literature, rebukes me for my presumption in having an opinion and in venturing to express it. Surely I am entitled to examine his own credentials. If they prove to be defective, that is Mr. ———'s misfortune and not my fault."

---

### "English Literature."

THE *American Nation* (March 3rd, 1904), has the following:—

"The treatment of Shakspeare's work is full and judicious, but that of his life is not quite so satisfactory. While the author of a separate biography of the poet may feel it his duty at least to mention every apocryphal tradition and absurd mare's-nest that gossip has handed down or conjecture invented, one would think that a work like this would keep soberly to the ascertained facts and to probabilities only just short of certainty, and, where there are gaps in the record, let them be gaps, without trying to fill them up with brain cobwebs."

It is announced, by the way, that Dr. Garnett has written a play in which William Shakespeare is one of the characters.

---

### Stratford Visitors.

AT the annual meeting of the Birthplace Trustees it was announced that during the past year the number of visitors had largely increased. The total of 31,519 exceeded the preceding total by nearly 4,500.

---

### "The Poet's Corner."

MR. MAX BEERHOLME's latest caricatures, entitled *The Poet's Corner*, include a design showing Shaksper with an expressive gesture receiving from a

figure remarkably like Francis Bacon the MS. of *Hamlet*. The drawing is subscribed "William Shakespeare. His method of work."

---

### Bacon's City Mansion.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—In William Maitland's *History of London* (1739) occurs this passage, p. 482: "St. Olive, Silver Street. Near the north end of this noble street stood the city mansion of Lord Bacon." Has anyone heard of this mansion before?

In Maitland's edition of 1775 this house is omitted altogether. But the index refers us to p. 1370, with these words: "Lord Bacon his House."

An assistant librarian at Guildhall Library and I searched in vain for any such House on p. 1370. The only reference I could find was a description of the first play house erected in the neighbourhood of the City of London. On p. 1371 there was a description of Canonbury House at Islington, more generally called Cambray House. But with no reference whatever to the fact that Francis Bacon ever lived there.

A large presentation copy, scarce, of Thomas Edlyne Tomlin's *History of Yseldon* (1858), is in the Guildhall Library, and that contains the information denied us in so many large and important histories that Bacon was closely and long associated with Canonbury.

Sir Thomas Fowler had a fine mansion here at Canonbury. Is this the "Malvolio" of our last issue? Baronet, created 1628, died 1656. His lease dated 1599. A. A. L.

---

### Alleyn—Author?

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—May I point out that in the memoirs of Edward Alleyn, by Payne Collier, p. 184-5, stands this: "It might be supposed from certain memoranda in Henslowe's account-book that Alleyn was an author; in August, 1602, he received £4 for two books, 'Philip of Spain' and 'Longshanks.' In October of the same year he was paid 40s. for 'his booke of Tamber came,' etc. Nevertheless, it is not to be supposed that he was concerned in the writing, though he very likely was instrumental in the getting up of those pieces, the unnamed poets having entrusted their productions to him in consequence of his interest in the theatre. Alleyn doubtless lent his assistance in

preparing it for the stage (Tamar Cam), and in this way, possibly, he entitled himself to the 40s. paid to him by Henslowe. He might, however, only receive it in trust for those who were engaged with him in bringing it before the public."

John Taylor, the water poet [folio 1630, p. 142, *et seq.*], has the following verse as his testimony to the way acting managers posed as authors in his day:—

"Thou brag'st what fame thou got'st upon the stage.  
Upon St. George's Day last, sir, you gave  
To eight Knights of the Garter (like a knave),  
Eight manuscripts (or books) all fairlie writ;  
Informing them they were your mother wit,  
And you compil'd them; then were you regarded,  
All this is true, and this I dare maintain,  
The matter came from out a learned brain."

Fennor was the delinquent who produced "*England's Foy*." It seems that Heming and Condell might easily have been led by Shaxper to believe him the author of the plays he produced.

A. B.

10, Clorane Gardens, Hampstead.

---

## Honorificabilitudine.

### TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—I notice in BACONIANA for April, an unsigned note headed "Honorificabilitudine" in which you say that a correspondent informs you—among other things—that the letter after the l in the word as it appears in the Northumberland MS. is not i, but either e or c and that the last letter of the word is e not o. I have never seen the original MS., and have formed my opinion from the production in Mr. Reed's "*Bacon versus Shakspeare*."

I believe, however, that the latter of the two propositions is correct, that the final letter is e, because that would give the word the form of the ablative of the third declension, which it is, and not second declension. The attempt to substitute c or e for i after the l is, however, absurd, because in neither case would the combination of letters spell anything. The inability to distinguish the dot of the i in a MS. of that age and in condition that that is, is quite to be expected.

But what I want to call your especial attention to is the injustice you have done me in the final paragraph, "It does not permit the anagrammatic interpretation given it by Dr. Platt." I never gave it any anagrammatic interpretation. The anagram I called attention to a few years ago is of the word honorificabilitudinitatibus in "*Love's Labour Lost*," and in regard to which there can be no doubt of its spelling. All I said of the



Northumberland MS. word that it might—and of course it might not—have resulted in an experiment to work out an anagram, and that it was an anagram of “Hi ludi, Fr. Bacono initio.” This was of no consequence and was merely suggested. Moreover, the change of the final letter to e makes no practical difference, for you in that case simply write Bacone and the sense remains the same, and I do not know why he might not decline his name in the third declension if he saw fit; but, anyhow, I only suggested that it might be a rejected form.

ISAAC HULL PLATT.

Bryn Mawr, April 27th 1904.

## “Concealed Lands.”

TO THE EDITOR OF “BACONIANA.”

SIR,—S. Lewis Junr., in his History of St. Mary, Islington, [Guildhall Library, 1842] states that the Manor of Highbury, 10th January, 1625, was granted to Bacon in trust for Charles on a lease of 99 years, which became merged in the Crown. He speaks of *Concealed Lands* and says that these were only let or leased to people who would *search* them, and that these are called “Concealers.” Were Canonbury and Highbury both *Concealed Lands*? and was Francis Bacon a “Concealer”? Esmé, Count D'Aubigny, is mentioned as one of these “Concealers,” and we know James I. gave him a lease of St. John's Gate in 1612, in which spot the rehearsals of Shakespeare plays were held.

A STAUNCH BACONIAN.

## John Aubrey.

TO THE EDITOR OF “BACONIANA.”

SIR,—In regarding Aubrey's visit to the neighbourhood of Stratford as a fact, I relied not only on the testimony of Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps and, so far as I am aware, all other writers on the subject, but on what appears to me the convincing internal evidence afforded by the notes on Shakspere themselves in his “Lives.” As regards the exact date of the occurrence I spoke loosely, as, at whatever period of Aubrey's life it happened (if it happened at all, as I took it for granted), it must have been at a date not further removed from the death of the Stratford player than the investigations of Canon Rawnsley from the decease of the poet of Rydal, and this was sufficient for the purpose of my little article.

It will be interesting to see whether Mr. Hastings White's inquiry elicits any further evidence on the subject.

JOHN HUTCHINSON,



## Bears.

## TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—On page 99 of BACONIANA for April, 1904, occurs the statement that the mode adopted by bears of licking their young into shape, was the mode Rawley describes Bacon as adopting to perfect his own literary works; and the writer goes on to add that "Shakespeare shows a similar acquaintance with the then unpublished scientific note."

This is erroneous, as the circumstance of Bears so shaping their young is recorded by Pliny in Book VIII. cap. 54.

W. THEOBALD.

## Thomas Hobbs and William Rowley.

## TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Were Thomas Hobbs and William Rowley, [gents] who figure in an agreement drawn up between the theatrical company of the Hope Theatre and Edward Alleyne, Manager-actor, Francis Bacon's secretaries? [p. 127, Edward Alleyne's memoirs.] William Rowley, D.D., may have only taken holy orders (as other actors of that day were known to have done) late in life. Would it be as well to trace their signatures, his and Hobbs, in the document, with a view to identifying them? Thomas Lodge, player, practiced as Doctor of Physic [Edward Alleyne's memoirs, p. 46], and Ben Jonson, player, is called "bricklayer" in *Henslowe's Diary*. Robert Green, actor, is said to have taken holy orders and been a Royal Chaplain. Mr. Dyce infers Greene was a divine from a note in a copy of *George a Greene, the Pinner of Wakefield*, "Written by—— a minister who acted the pinner's part in it himself. Teste W. Shakespeare."

Samuel Rowley "was a servant to the Prince," and a writer of "*When you see me you know me*," and "*The Noble Soldier*," in striking likeness to Shakespeare. Who was Will Rowley?

L. A.